

## **REMARKS**

In response to the Office Action dated August 3, 2004, claims 1 and 2 have been amended and claim 3 canceled. No new matter has been added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the claims as requested is respectfully requested.

Applicants note the Examiner's attachment regarding Applicant's submission of informal drawings with the application. Applicants will provide formal drawings upon allowance of the application.

Applicants note that the drawings were objected to on several grounds. Applicants have amended Figures 1, 2 and 3 to overcome this objection. In Figure 1, the connections between output node (11) and the evaluation circuits (50,60) have been deleted. Applicants have also added functional labels to the blank boxes in Figures 1 and 2. In Figure 3, the previously added line connecting node (13) to node (11) has been deleted.

Applicants believe the drawings are now acceptable and respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the objections therefrom.

On page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-14, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, but have amended the application to overcome the objections. Claim 1 has been amended and claim 3 canceled to conform with the amended drawings. It is believed that all claims comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-14, 16, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

On page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6, 7-10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawabata (US 6,650,152) in view of Talbot (US 6,445,253) further in view of McPartland, et al. (US 6,552,931) and Gaalema (US 5,523,864). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, but have amended the application to overcome the objections.

Three criteria must be met to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference, or combination of references, must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2142. The Applicants traverse the rejections because the cited references fail to disclose all the claim limitations.

Claim 1, as amended, provides:

A driver circuit, having at least one input node for an input signal and at least one output node for an output signal, having one or more, preferably two, subdrivers, and having a feedback circuit, which has one or more evaluation circuits and one or more feedback capacitors, the evaluation circuits being connected to the subdrivers and the feedback capacitors respectively being provided between the at least one output node of the driver circuit and an input node of the evaluation circuit, the at least one evaluation circuit having a first inverter stage, coupled to the input node of the evaluation circuit, and a second inverter stage, coupled with the first inverter stage, the first inverter stage comprising at least a first transistor of a first polarity and a first transistor of a second polarity, the second polarity being different from the first polarity, wherein the control terminal of the first transistor of the first polarity and the control terminal of the first transistor of the second polarity are coupled to the input node of the evaluation circuit, wherein a second terminal of the first transistor of the first polarity and a second terminal of the first transistor of

the second polarity are coupled to each other and to the input node of the evaluation circuit, wherein the second inverter stage comprises at least a second transistor of the first polarity and a second transistor of the second polarity, and wherein a second terminal of the second transistor of the first polarity and a second terminal of the second transistor of the second polarity are coupled to each other and to the subdrivers, wherein a low-harmonics current is generated in the driver circuit and supplied to a load, and wherein an edge steepness that is independent of the present load situation is set in the driver circuit.

Neither Kawabata, Talbot, McPartland or Gaalema, nor the combination thereof, teach or suggest all elements of the inventive claim 1, as amended, including *inter alia*, the disclosure and claiming of the inventive driver circuit wherein a low- harmonics current is generated in the driver circuit and supplied to a load, and wherein an edge steepness that is independent of the present load situation is set in the driver circuit.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references individually and in combination fail to teach or suggest all limitations of amended claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Kawabata in view of Talbot further in view of McPartland and Gaalema.

Dependent claims 2-3, 6, 7-10, which are dependent from independent claim 1, were also rejected as being unpatentable over Kawabata in view of Talbot further in view of McPartland and Gaalema. While the Applicants do not acquiesce to the particular rejections to these dependent claims, it is asserted that these rejections are moot in view of the remarks made in connection with independent claim 1. These dependent claims include all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims, and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from the

proposed combination of references. Therefore, dependent claims 2-3, 6, 7-10, are also in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-3, 6, 7-10, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawabata in view of Talbot further in view of McPartland and Gaalema.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the amendments and reasons provided above, it is believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. The amendments clarify the patentable invention without adding new subject matter. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early allowance of all pending claims.

If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicant's attorney of record, Jeffrey R. Stone at 952 253-4130.

Respectfully submitted,

Altera Law Group, LLC  
Customer No. 22865

Date: 2/3/05

By: 

Jeffrey R. Stone  
Reg. No. 47,976  
JRS/mej